DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 942 JC 890 302

AUTHOR Winter, Gene M.; Fadale, LaVerna M.
TITLE SUNY Youth Internship Program: A Summary Review.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Development Center.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Economically Disadvantaged; *Employment Programs; *Internship Programs; *Out of School Youth; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Skill Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A Youth Internship Program (YIP) has been developed at seven community colleges of the State University of New York (SUNY) to improve the employability potential of unemployed, out-of-school, economically disadvantaged youth between 16 and 21 years of age. Components of the seven programs examined differ, but all address six main activities: recruitment and intake; instruction in academic, life, and/or employability skills; the provision of internships or work experience; program evaluation; financial accounting; and the development of links with other agencies providing similar services. An external evaluation was conducted in September of 1988 to provide a profile of the seven programs and to determine the extent to which program activities were achieving their objectives. For the program as a whole, over 2,500 youth have been served in some way by YIP. More than 1,500 of these were involved in one or more instructional components, nearly 1,000 participated in a subsidized internship, and 31% of the participants ultimately found employment or continued their education. The evaluation report recommends the following: (1) efforts should be made to obtain a state commitment for ongoing support of the program; (2) there should be an increase of opportunities for communication and sharing among local programs; (3) more specific guidelines should be provided by SUNY to enable more meaningful compilation of performance data across programs; and (4) consideration should be given to seeking follow-up data earlier than the one-year time period set forth in the legislation. Attachments include a YIP site interview schedule and a memo from the Office of Community Colleges to the presidents of the community colleges regarding a request for YIP proposals for 1988-89. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307942

SUNY YOUTH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM:

A SUMMARY REVIEW

Prepared by

Dr. Gene M. Winter, Director
Dr. LaVerna M. Fadale, Senior Research Associate

Two-Year College Development Center
University at Albany
State University of New York

This report is submitted
in compliance with
Chapter 53, Laws of 1988.

JC 890 302

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. M. Fadale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SEPTEMBER 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The successful conduct of on-site interviews at seven SUNY community college campuses across New York State during late summer of 1988 required the cooperation of many individuals. We want to express our appreciation to administrators and staff at each of the colleges with active Youth Internship Programs. In particular, we thank the seven YIP coordinators who arranged and participated in the site visitations:

Terence S. Nash, Columbia-Greene Community College

Carlos Vernon, Erie Community College

Rose Greene, Hudson Valley Community College

James Kiernan, Mohawk Valley Community College

Anne L. B. Bryant, Monroe Community College

Diane Secours, North Country Community College

Paula Setteducati, Suffolk County Community College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF YIP PROGRAMS	4
Recruitment and Intake	4
Instructional Components	5
Internship Components	6
Program Evaluations	7
Financial Accounting	8
Linkages	8
Columbia-Greene Community College	9
Erie Community College	10
Monroe Community College	12
Hudson Valley Community College	12
North Country Community College	13
Mohawk Valley Community College	14
Suffolk County Community College	15
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
Clients and Commitment	16
Performance Outcomes	17
Program Costs	20
Recommendations	22
Performance Data	22
Guideline Clarification	22
Communication	24
Continuation	25
Program Operations	25
Concluding Statement	26
ATTACHMENT A	29
ATTACHMENT B	30
ATTACHMENT C	31

SUNY YOUTH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM: A SUMMARY REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The Youth Internship Program (YIP) is made possible by an annual appropriation by the Legislature to provide noncredit employability training and work experiences or internships for a targeted clientele. The general purpose is to improve the employability potential of unemployed, out-of-school, economically disadvantaged youth between 16 and 21 years of age. The legislation authorized that YIP be administered by the State University of New York. Since community colleges are designated as the program delivery system, the Office of Community Colleges serves as the administering unit. The legislation also suggests that these funds be used in conjunction with the resources of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and/or other public or private sources. Attachment A consists of the legislation.

Participant campuses are selected based on the recommendation of an outside review committee consisting of representatives of the New York State Department of Labor, State Education Department and SUNY Research Foundation, all of whom are experienced in the field of job training. Their recommendations are based on an appraisal of the campus proposal and an assessment of the previous achievement of the campus program.

An evaluation report (September 1988) by an external agency was legislated pursuant to Chapter 53, Laws of 1988. In late July, the Two-Year College Development Center, University at Albany, was engaged by State University Central Administration, Office of Community Colleges, to conduct the review. The purpose of the review was seen as profiling

currently operational programs, and determining the extent to which program activities are achieving objectives. Program outcome measures reflected the intent of the legislation, and included the extent to which participants attained unsubsidized employment and/or continued their education or training in high school, GED, postsecondary or private sector education/training programs.

The data collection process began with an examination of individual college proposals and reports that had been submitted to the State University of New York since the initial program year (1984). This was followed by discussions with SUNY Central administrators with responsibility for administering the YIP program. A working outline of available data and information for each program was compiled to serve as a basis for on-site interviewing. Although two colleges, Westchester Community College and Sullivan County Community College, had previously been funded to operate programs, the focus of the review was limited to the seven currently operational programs at Columbia-Greene Community College, Erie Community College, Hudson Valley Community College, Mohawk Valley Community College, Monroe Community College, North Country Community College, and Suffolk County Community College. The President and Project Coordinator at each college was notified of the review by letter from the Office of Community Colleges. On-site interviews were subsequently arranged and held at each site with program staff and appropriate college administrators. (The interview schedule is Attachment B.) These sessions resulted in clarification of information and an update of data, particularly regarding outcomes, resources, linkages and strategies.

The remainder of this report is organized in two sections. The first describes program elements of the seven currently operational programs. The second is a discussion and summary of findings and recommendations.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF YIP PROGRAMS

Each of the operational YIP programs operates within the general parameters set forth in the legislation but approaches and strategies vary to reflect local needs and problems. Objectives of the operational programs reflect the authorizing legislation and commonly include:

a) to assess the employability of out-of-school youth from which individual training/employment plans are formulated;

b) to provide employability, academic and skills training;

c) to provide an internship or work experience with a stipend that reflects local prevailing wages for similar work performed.

Activity elements that address recruitment and intake, instruction in academic, life, and/or employability skills, internship or work experience, evaluation, financial accounting, and linkage development are found in each of the seven program formats. However, differences are found in terms of program scope, focus and operational detail.

Recruitment and Intake

Recruitment, enrollment and/or intake activities are common to all programs. There are varying degrees of active linkages to promote recruitment, but most programs have some working relationships with local high schools, Departments of Social Services (DSS) and/or probation departments, and JTPA programs. In some instances, JTPA actually recruits, identifies clients, and does initial or intake assessments. In other programs, the local school district is the primary provider of potential clients through referrals and informal contacts. Still other programs recruit directly from the community

through media, posters, ads and information meetings at community agencies and organizations.

The intake procedure usually consists of testing academic skill levels, career interests and life skills. The results of these assessments are used in counseling and advising sessions to result in an employability profile or plan for each individual. In most cases individual skill assessment and counseling are roles of YIP program staff.

Instructional Components

All YIP programs incorporate instruction of academic skills but again in varying formats. The focus of skills instruction may be remedial, pre-GED or direct preparation for the GED. The level of instruction is linked to the needs and performance levels of each individual participating in the program. Most programs have an instructional component that addresses life skills such as reading employment want ads, check writing and money management, the kinds of skills needed to operate in today's world, plus help to develop coping skills and a more positive self-perspective.

Each program also addresses employability skills through an instructional format. The focus is usually on preparation for obtaining and holding a job, preparation of resumes, readiness determination, job search, responsibilities and roles in the workplace, skills of interviewing, and positive attitudes toward holding a job.

While a strong instructional component is a common factor in all YIP programs, variations found within instructional components are often due to local program philosophy and/or the extent to which another agency assumes direct responsibility for each component. In some

instances, JTPA efforts provide employability skills instruction; in others, this instruction is a function of program staff. Remedial or basic skill instruction ranges from instruction by college remedial skills departments to specific GED instruction offered on an ongoing basis at a secondary school, BOCES, or an Educational Opportunity Center. Several programs have occupational skill courses available for students who need minimum academic remediation.

Internship Components

Each program has a component that provides work experience or internships. This internship component brings with it a necessity that someone serve as job developer to identify potential sites, cultivate employer cooperation and establish procedures so that each situation becomes a potentially successful internship. In some cases, this is done by college or YIP program staff while in others, it is done by a county agency, often JTPA supported program staff.

During the actual internship period, all programs provide varying amounts of monitoring , support, and collection of feedback/evaluation from participants and employers. The pattern of evaluation ranges from informal drop-in, and occasional telephone calls to more formal strategies with forms that are completed at designated times, and regularly scheduled worksite visitations.

In some programs, an understanding is developed with each internship employer that the preferred outcome of the site experience is unsubsidized employment of the individual. In others, there is little emphasis on that specific outcome because the intern sites are viewed more as an employability training experience which will eventually lead

to unsubsidized employment at some other site. In either case, the importance of the employer as trainer is acknowledged by all.

The time period for internships vary within the parameters allowed by the legislation. In some cases, they are set as a 20-week effort, in others, a 10-week effort. Some program by hours, such as up to 500 hours, while others take a much more individualized or open-ended approach depending on the individual's performance.

Scheduling is a difference found in the internship component. Some begin only after a specific time of instruction in employability and/or educational components; in others it can begin earlier or later depending on the individual and internship availability. Usually internships run concurrently with instruction, a half day devoted to instruction and a half day at the work site. In other cases, full time is devoted to classes for a period of time, followed by the work experience. The schedulings vary but intent and overall strategies remain rather similar across programs.

Program Evaluations

All programs collect outcome data. In a few instances, the data are geared to JTPA regulations in order to assure compatibility of information. Some have set up a computerized or standardized format that facilitates follow-up of individuals and of monitoring program achievements. Others maintain records by YIP year including attendance records, participant files, employer evaluations, etc. Several maintain records of GED recipients. Follow-up efforts range from a formal survey with designated times for contacts to informal contacts with clients, employers, agencies and when appropriate, the college if participants subsequently enroll as students. Each program has developed forms to

facilitate record-keeping as well as client skill attainment, with several forms based on those used by other training agencies.

As indicated previously, all programs provide strategies for monitoring during internship periods. This ongoing feedback is used to adjust program strategies as appropriate to individual needs. All program staff recognize the importance of follow-up data in order to document performance outcomes, but the effort given to follow-up and the kinds of information sought are not consistent across programs. They recognize that the YIP legislation for this year sets forth a new requirement for follow-up studies.

Financial Accounting

All programs report that budget and financial records are maintained by college accounting offices using commonly accepted procedures. Many programs seek and receive approval from SUNY Central Administration to carry-over unused funds from one year to another. This becomes particularly important given the nature of many programs and the widely varying skill levels of the students. Ending times depend on entry times and the severity of individual needs. Most programs operate on a basis of continuous recruitment rather than fixed enrollment thereby resulting in the necessity for continual programs.

Linkages

There is variance in the extent to which JTPA, Departments of Social Services, Probation Departments, secondary schools/BOCES, Educational Opportunity Centers, and other agencies providing similar services are cooperatively linked with YIP programs. Although each site has developed working relations with some local agencies, the only

linkage common to all programs is with a local secondary school or BOCES.

A major strength of the YIP effort is the flexibility allowed each program to determine appropriate local strategies in order to successfully achieve the goals set forth by the legislation. As a result, each program develops characteristics or features that reflect local needs and regional differences. In some instances, these features have grown out of program modifications and improvements made since the initial cycle. In others, they have developed because of situational factors unique to a particular region or college. The following summaries briefly address each program and its featured approaches.

Columbia-Greene Community College:

The YIP program at Columbia-Greene Community College operates on a philosophy of readiness for the workforce, and since YIP III, the program has been closely aligned with JTPA. (Previous to YIP III the focus was a group work experience of creating a play based on vignettes of job successes.) Program features include:

- The Employment and Training Office of the JTPA coordinator is located on the college campus, and the YIP program easily meshes with JTPA activities. The region has a work readiness program, and both JTPA and YIP are a functional part of this effort. A continuing concern is that individuals leave the program and take "a job" before actually ready for for success in the workforce.
- The service area for this YIP program is primarily rural, consists of small towns and cities, and has no public transportation. This causes a problem with internship

placement since selection of work sites is limited by opportunities to reach available sites. Currently a few interns are transported by school buses.

- Through an alternative high school program offered at the local BOCES, clients were able to earn a high school diploma from Troy High School. Recently this alternative became unavailable, the academic instruction continues at BOCES but leads to the GED.
- In addition to basic academic and life skills, work maturity competencies are incorporated into instruction and can result in a certificate of achievement. Performance related to these competencies is certified by the cooperating site employer as part of the evaluation process.

Erie Community College:

The program at Erie Community College is by far the largest and the number of clients served exceeds all other programs. The program is located at the City Campus allowing for easy accessibility by targeted clientele. Program staff report that the unemployment situation in the inner city it serves has not improved to the extent it has in other areas, particularly for out-of-school youth. A large portion of program clients are unwed mothers which leads to a growing need for child care services.

Since the major change of administration and procedures occurred several years ago, program adjustments have been minor modifications or "fine tuning." For example, pre-GED courses were added, and a computer

module has recently been included because of its broad application to both the work world and personal use. Other program features include:

- The Educational Opportunity Center in Buffalo provides both pre-GED and GED instruction for YIP students.
- Seven-week modules of instruction (life skills, self-development, introduction to computers) are offered in sequence and are scheduled to mesh with the EOC format.
- An employability profile and testing to determine placement are part of the intake/application procedure. Also to emphasize commitment, a contract that specifies expectations and roles by participant and program is drawn up and mutually signed as part of intake.
- Internship site selection is heavily influenced by employer attitude toward eventually hiring the student. The term "tryout employment" is used rather than internship to reflect the notion that an employer has an opportunity to train an employee at no cost. This results in a high percentage, approximately 60-65%, of internship employers hiring the interns.
- Staff report no success in obtaining complementary funding from JTPA and DSS.
- The program uses a technique of 90-day hold or stop-out period (rather than drop-out) that provides time for development of alternate work site locations, or dealing with family problems/death, or long-term illness.

Monroe Community College:

The YIP program at Monroe Community College functions as part of STAGE (Skills Training for Academic Growth and Employment). The program operates in downtown Rochester, closer to clients and on more public transportation routes than a campus-based location. Staff report that drop-out rates of youth continue to rise in the area, particularly for minorities, while employment needs are for more skilled, job-ready and educated workers. The YIP program focuses on upgrading high school drop-outs to reach acceptable employability levels.

The program is conceived in 15-week blocks with five weeks of half-day sessions in pre-employment training, which leads to the internship. The other half-day is devoted to GED classes. Typically, the internship period is ten weeks at about 20 hours per week. Youths are expected to continue their GED classes during and after the internship, and an attempt for placement in an unsubsidized job begins after ten weeks. Other program aspects include:

- STAGE is a self-contained program providing all recruitment, assessment, instruction, job development and support.
- During internships the employer pays the student directly and YIP funds are used to reimburse the employer.
- Additional funds have been secured from a Department of Labor grant, and the private sector--Xerox.
- The director is now supported by college funds.

Hudson Valley Community College:

The YIP program at Hudson Valley Community College is housed at the Capital District Educational Opportunity Center which also provides academic/GED training, vocational training and counseling. Because

these are part of ongoing offerings at the EOC, clients have the advantage of being able to select from a number of curricula. The program is located in downtown Troy, easily accessible by public transportation. Other features include:

- Employers are not required to hire the intern as the internship is expected to be a work experience or training ground that provides a basis for other job-seeking activities. This approach results in about 75% of the interns obtaining full-time employment, but not necessarily at the internship site.
- The length of the internship is open, based on individual need and progress. About 20 weeks serves as a decision time-point regarding whether or not the experience should be extended.
- As yet there is no formal follow-up of outcomes. Contact is informal, particularly focusing on those that withdrew from the program or are nonsuccessful.
- Over the years few drastic changes have been made, but there have been ongoing modifications. In looking ahead, the program hopes to expand the geographical area from which it draws, and place a greater emphasis on choice of college as an alternative for those who show potential for jobs requiring advanced skill levels.

North Country Community College:

The primary problem faced by the North Country Community College YIP program is the lack of population density in their expanse of geography. Earlier program cycles had several counties involved but

because of the vast service area, the program currently operates in Franklin and Essex Counties. Other features of the program include:

- The county JTPA employment and training agencies (Franklin Employment and Training Agency and Essex County Economic, Inc.) do recruitment, intake, job development, and placement for the YIP program. The college focuses on the education dimension in preparing for work. The desired outcomes are employment and/or enrollment at the college to upgrade employability skill levels with eventual placement in better paying jobs.
- A flexible internship is offered by the program, that is, at 500 hours a progress review is made with the potential of 500 more hours being arranged.
- Franklin County interprets out-of-school youth as those individuals who are no longer in school, regardless of graduation status, and are seeking productive employment.

Mohawk Valley Community College:

The program at Mohawk Valley Community College began during YIP III, 1987, thus is a relatively young program compared to others. It is currently in the process of change with new personnel, and new program elements and strategies planned and ready for implementation. The program is refocusing and seeking to develop stronger links with other service providers to order to better serve the local out-of-school youth in the area. Aspects of the program include:

- Vocational skills training sessions are offered concurrently with academic training to YIP clients.
- The internship begins with and is concurrent to the

instructional components.

- The college as an employer provides some internships.

Suffolk County Community College:

The format of the YIP program at Suffolk County Community College has been more or less consistent since its start in YIP I. Some adjustments to increase program effectiveness have been made such as adding rigor to the testing or assessment phase, additional instructional components such as keyboarding, a stronger emphasis on the GED, and providing more intensive counseling. The program was originally located in a vacant elementary school then moved to the campus. Next year the program will be offered at the Techni-Center, an extension site in Brentwood and at the Ammerman Campus. Other features of the program include:

- The program is self-contained, providing recruitment, assessment, basic skill instruction, employability skill awareness, and development and coordination of the internship.
- The program does its own promotion particularly with the high schools, guidance counselors and attendance officers, and with community agencies, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, libraries, etc.
- The program has experienced difficulty in locating clients for follow-up assessments because of their unstable living patterns.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Clients and Commitment

There is no doubt that YIP programs are being carried out by people committed to increasing employability of out-of-school, disadvantaged youth. There is also no doubt that the targeted clientele are a very special group comprised of individuals who have had little success in formal education or alternate school situations and live on the edge of our education, economic and social systems. These people are yesterday's at-risk youth who have fulfilled the prophecy. It is within this context of serving these individuals that YIP programs operate and their performance outcomes are judged.

Since many out-of-school, disadvantaged youth are carrying legal, family and social service problems along with their educational problems, YIP offers a flexible alternative for merging efforts of JTPA, Social Service, and educational agencies supplemented with a paid work experience. As indicated by several local staff members, YIP allows for "putting it all together" and the teaching of both basic and employability skills in a supportive situation. Many otherwise qualified clients choose not to participate or stay with the program long enough, but for those with appropriate readiness and motivation, YIP offers a pay-off in both educational status and job attainment. Program staff report that many clients are in need of a program like YIP, even though unemployment in general is low across the State.

Performance Outcomes

YIP legislation states basic performance goals as obtaining unsubsidized employment, enrollment in an educational or training program and completion of a high school education.

Although programs differ on the actual activities and resources expended on individuals from the application stage through placement, an instructional component and an internship component are uniform elements of all programs. Similarly, obtaining employment and continuing in some education or training program are viewed as positive terminations at all sites.

After reviewing the differences in scope and specificity of data collected by the various local programs, the following categories were selected for which data would be sought from each college for each year of the YIP program.

Total number served: This category includes persons who at a minimum made an application or enrolled in a program. This number does not include inquiries even though some staff time may have been expended.

Instructional component: This category includes all enrollees who participated in at least one instructional component (academic skills, career interest, life-coping skills, employability skills).

Internship component: This includes all participants who had an internship or work experience. In nearly all cases these individuals have also participated in an instructional component.

Unsubsidized employment or military: This category was used to aggregate numbers of YIP clients who were known to have obtained

unsubsidized employment of any kind following their YIP experience, or joined the military forces.

Continuing education: This includes those YIP clients who were known to be continuing in any educational or training program.

SUMMARY PERFORMANCE DATA
Youth Internship Program

Program Year	Total Served	Instructional Component	Internship Component	Unsubsidized Employment/ Military	Continuing Education
I ('84-5)	511	301	211	101	86
II ('85-6)	854	450	242	119	87
III ('86-7)	728	385	281	137	99
*IV ('87-8)	476	371	229	94	81
TOTAL	2,569	1,507	963	451	353

*estimated figures due to incomplete program year

The table details numbers of clients served during the four years of YIP appropriations. These data are compilations of numbers from the seven colleges currently operating programs as well as from Westchester Community College and Sullivan County Community College who had programs in the earlier years of YIP.

The table shows that over 2,500 youth have been served in some way by YIP programs. More than 1,500 or almost 60% of the total were involved in one or more instructional components. Of these 1,500 youth nearly 1,000 participated in a subsidized internship. The known positive terminations (employment and continuing education) total more than 800 youth, or 31% of all participants served in some way. The

total number that obtained unsubsidized employment (451) represents almost half of those who participated in an internship.

Local program staff feel that the real number of positive terminations is higher but are unable to document it due to difficulties in locating clients once they leave the program. Follow-up attempts at some sites have resulted in information on less than one-third of their original clientele.

One cannot look at numbers such as these without asking questions about performance standards. Is it acceptable that 40% or more of those who enroll or apply, choose to leave before beginning an instructional program? Local program staff have varying responses to this question but all responses involve client characteristics and experience. Several programs make special efforts to inform their clientele about all the aspects of the YIP program at the start. They want the youth to really understand the program and see the presence of a client's commitment as necessary to future persistence. They believe YIP is more than an entitlement program. Similarly, most programs do not place youth in internships if they are not "ready" for the work experience. Local staff work hard to develop good relations with businesses and want the internship to be a valuable experience for both the youth and the employer.

One appropriate basis for comparison may be the positive terminations achieved by youth (14-21) in the Basic Skills School to Work component of JTPA programs. The following data were shared by the JTPA Coordinating Unit, State Education Department. For the JTPA 1986 program year, positive terminations were 53.8% of total enrollment

(Total N = 4,444). For ages 18-21 only, N = 2,503, 21% were positive terminations or obtained unsubsidized employment.

The percentage of positive terminations to total enrollment (53.8% JTPA, 53% of YIP clients taking instruction) compares favorably. The results are more favorable for YIP positive terminations in terms of those clients who also participated in an internship component (84%).

However, is a 31% positive termination rate of all YIP clients served an acceptable outcome? Perhaps it is, given that these 800 youth are already school dropouts and many are also clients of other social support systems. Looking at the program progressively, from initial enrollment through instruction to internship, the casualty rate is high but the success rate of those experiencing an internship, the thrust of the YIP program, is also high. From one point of view, every single positive outcome pays off in lower social costs. Program staff also report that every program success becomes a program recruiter.

Program Costs

The annual YIP allocation has been $1 million with funding made available to colleges based on competitive proposals for local program operations in amounts that ranged from $60,000 to more than $400,000. We found that many colleges were unable to use their approved allocation in a given year and often sought and gained approval to extend or carry over unused funds into the subsequent year. As noted previously, this carryover is essential given the continuous recruitment nature of the programs.

The legislation encourages local cost sharing, using JTPA and other public and private sources to complement YIP funds. Several colleges have been very successful in obtaining support from county

employment and training sources, Social Service programs, and educational institutions. One program has obtained private sector support and a D.O.L. grant to supplement training resources. There are other instances in which YIP funds and college in-kind contributions serve as the sole sources of program support. It appears that JTPA funded programs view YIP as a competitor in some localities but as a co-worker in others.

We feel that some gross estimates of program costs should be made part of this report, with full recognition that some students begin YIP late in the fiscal year and continue the following year, that outcome data are not uniformly collected or complete, and that unused funds are often carried forward. Over the four-year period examined, a total of 2,569 student clients were enrolled and served in some manner. Dividing the $4 million allocation by 2,569, an estimated average cost per student served can be estimated at $1,557. Similarly, an average cost per positive termination (unsubsidized employment N = 451 + continuing education/training N = 353) is estimated as $4,975.

To some extent the higher cost per positive termination results from a lack of follow-up data on all program completers and leavers. Some differences in costs can also be a function of the ability of local programs to obtain supplementary funding. Examination of individual college costs show that program size and number of years in YIP are not consistently related to either higher or lower costs per student. The differences among colleges in terms of program unit costs are a function of several factors and not necessarily an indicator of effectiveness.

Recommendations

Performance Data. The outcome data demonstrate that local YIP programs are appropriately addressing the intent of the legislation and the primary goal of increased employability has been accomplished for a significant number of program participants. Since comprehensive follow-up has not been consistently collected by all programs over the four-year period, the total impact is unclear. However the legislation now requires an annual SUNY evaluation report and directs SUNY to prescribe a methodology and collection of follow-up data by the local programs. Therefore it would assist local program coordinators and SUNY if the requested performance data could be specified. We have found that local definition of terms can vary. These specifications could serve as the basis for guidelines which should be distributed in the beginning of the year to enable orderly collection of desired information for both local program follow-up and annual report purposes. More details are needed than are currently contained in the guidelines sent with the Request for Proposals. In addition to the minimum performance data stated in the legislation, we recommend consideration of the categories that have been used in this report. Given the difficulty of locating clients after they have left the program, consideration needs to be given to follow-up techniques. Perhaps successful strategies can be shared among programs and a set of procedures compiled for use by all programs.

Guideline Clarification. Local YIP coordinators appreciate the degree of operational flexibility that has been granted to them. However, we suggest a need for further technical clarification of several items in the guidelines published as part of the Request for

Proposals. The following comments refer specifically to the YIP V RFP, dated June 1, 1988 and appended as Attachment C.

1.1: Does "out-of-school youth" intend to exclude a high school graduate or GED holder who is unemployed?

1.6: Wages of Interns

Guidelines and legislation speak of interns being paid at a rate comparable to regular employees in a similar job. There are instances of local programs paying interns by standard wage categories in order to treat all interns fairly. We feel that each program should have some flexibility in determining procedures and comparability. Perhaps the guidelines should reflect the degree of local judgment that is acceptable.

1.7: This states that the college will provide employability and academic or skill training from grant funds. Does this mean YIP? Some programs are providing this training from JTPA or other sources, not from YIP grant funds. We feel that the guidelines should be adjusted to allow for other sources of funding for this training. This is a technicality but--.

A related concern for word meaning is the language of the legislation which states ... "(3) employability and skills training funding by federal Job Training and Partnership Act or by public or private sources other than this appropriation." We assume

"this appropriation" means any funding source including YIP appropriation even though it doesn't specifically say so.

II.7: Return of Unused Funds

To the best of our knowledge most colleges keep separate financial records appropriate to usual accounting and audit procedures, however we did not intend to, nor did we perform any auditing as part of our evaluation. Most colleges seek and obtain approval to extend unused funds into a following year. We recommend that the guidelines mention the potential of extending or carrying over unused funds.

We are not aware of specific formats for financial reporting that were to be established by the SUNY Office for Finance and Business. It is recommended that this be done and that an annual financial report become part of the reporting requirements for YIP programs.

Communication. All local program coordinators have expressed needs generally related to communication. Two coordinators would like more help in locating youth unemployment and other local statistics requested in the proposal as part of the eligibility requirements. Staff from several programs have expressed a desire to know how others are coping with specific problems or how other programs are structured. A few also said they would like to receive more feedback from Central Administration on how the programs are doing. We feel that becoming aware that these feelings exist will trigger an increase in communications. We further recommend that consideration be given to hosting a workshop or conference for YIP coordinators/staff across the

State for the purposes of information exchange and sharing ideas. The new requirement for reporting and follow-up data could be primary agenda items. We and the program coordinators feel that such an activity could benefit all programs by promoting inter-program support linkages and the adaptation of successful program strategies.

Continuation. YIP has been funded on a year-by-year basis and local programs are staffed with hope but no firm plans for continuance. We feel the success of local YIP programming would be enhanced if it was perceived as something other than a one year effort. Toward that end we recommend that SUNY Central Administration meet with appropriate legislators to seek a sense of the future of YIP in order to assist in planning and managing the program both at the State and local levels.

We believe that YIP is a unique program approach to problems in achieving human potential and should be continued and expanded. We have observed how the paid internship and client age categories can be combined with other job development and social support programs to make a positive difference when job training and schooling alone were apparently not successful.

Program Operations. Two recommendations that we would have made on reporting requirements have already been included in the YIP legislation for the coming year; the annual follow-up study and the number of program participants who obtain a high school equivalency certificate. All programs emphasize GED instruction since the lack of a high school diploma is often a major barrier to employability. Follow-up studies are necessary to develop more meaningful outcome data, however many participants will be difficult to locate a year later due to changes in their living and working conditions. Many program

coordinators are currently frustrated with the lack of response to follow-up attempts or their inability to find clients who have completed the programs. Given these experiences, it is highly unlikely that follow-up a year after completion of a YIP program will result in sufficient data to make valid observations. Perhaps a shorter time period, such as two, three or four months subsequent to leaving the program, might increase the probability of better response rates.

The next suggestion is mentioned with some hesitation because we would not want YIP operations to lose local program flexibility. However, we feel that some consideration be given to an acceptable range of costs per enrollee or active participant. The broad range of differences in costs among the programs is related to many factors, including scope of services offered and success in obtaining supplementary funding at the local level. We do not feel that a legislated cap in cost per active student would be feasible or beneficial, but if a target range could be established, it would serve as a guideline to the colleges in terms of staffing and operational scope. Further study by SUNY of costs and outcomes may reveal trends or principles of program operation that could increase the efficiency of YIP.

Concluding Statement. YIP is not what most people would think of as a college program. YIP staff members are interested in changing behaviors, developing values and responsible work habits that most college staff members take for granted from their students. A YIP program is an educational community service, another opportunity for unemployed, out-of-school youth to seek what they as yet have not attained, a minimum level of education and a job. In one sense, it is a

safety net for a discrete group of individuals who have fulfilled the youth-at-risk prophecy. In many cases it provides a last chance to become productive and contributing citizens.

YIP is perhaps the one program for this age group that can combine services that already exist in other forms: adult education, JTPA, OJT, ADC, continuing higher education. A YIP program with its strong internship/work experience component is one more option in a community's arsenal of strategies to help people, an option that can be a stand-alone college service to the community or a cooperative venture involving the college and community agencies.

Major recommendations of this review, previously discussed in detail, are briefly summarized:

- The program has demonstrated its worth for the targeted clientele. Efforts should be made to obtain a State commitment for ongoing support of the program.
- If the intent to continue the program is obtained, there should be an increase of opportunities for communication and sharing among local programs.
- Consideration should be given to technical clarification of several items in the operational guidelines including meaning of certain terms that appear in the legislation.
- More specific guidelines should be provided by SUNY to enable more meaningful compilation of performance data across programs.

- Consideration should be given to seeking follow-up data earlier than the one-year time period set forth in the legislation.

ATTACHMENT A

YOUTH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Funds are provided for services and expenses related to non-credit employability training and work experience internship program pilot projects for the purposes of improving the employability of unemployed, out of school, economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21 years of age, reducing the levels of unemployment among such youth and helping to meet the current and future labor needs of employers in this state. Funds from this appropriation shall also be used for an independent evaluation of this program which shall be submitted to the chairmen of the senate finance and assembly ways and means committees and the director of the division of the budget by September 1, 1988. Participating youth shall be provided with the following for up to one year: (1) an individual employability assessment from which an individual training and employment plan is formulated; (2) an internship in a public agency, not-for-profit corporation, or private business not to exceed 1000 hours per year or 20 hours per week with a stipend funded from appropriations made pursuant to this chapter appropriation at the prevailing wage paid to persons similarly employed by the employers; and (3) employability and skills training funding by the federal job training partnership act (P.L. 97-300) or by public or private sources other than this appropriation.

The funds available pursuant to this appropriation shall be allocated to community colleges selected by the state university for participation in this program on the basis of their willingness and capability to operate a youth internship pilot project as described above and on the basis of the presence within their sponsorship areas of a high concentration of unemployed out of school, economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21.

The state university of New York shall submit an annual evaluation report on this program to the governor, the chairman of the senate finance committee, and the chairman of the assembly ways and means committee no later than August 31 following the program year ending June 30. The report shall, at a minimum, include a statement of program objectives which identifies the outcomes and indication of the effectiveness of the program. The evaluation shall at a minimum represent the extent to which program activities meet program objectives. The basic measures of performance shall include successful completion of a high school education, enrollment in a post secondary education or training program, or attainment of unsubsidized employment. The state university of New York shall prescribe a methodology and require collection of post program information on program participants including but not limited to whether a participant receives a high school degree and subsequent labor market experiences for one year following termination from the program 1,000,000

ATTACHMENT B

YIP Site Interview Schedule

July 25	Columbia-Greene Community College
July 27	Erie Community College
July 28	Monroe Community College
July 29	Hudson Valley Community College
August 1	North Country Community College
August 2	Mohawk Valley Community College
August 4	Suffolk County Community College

ATTACHMENT C

State University of New York

Memorandum to Presidents

Date: June 1, 1988 Vol. 88 No. 5

From: Office of Community Colleges

Subject: Request for Proposals
Youth Internship Program; 1988-89
"YIP-5"

To: Presidents, Community Colleges

The Youth Internship Program has been extended for another year with an allocation of $1 million. However, funds from this appropriation must be used for an independent evaluation of the program which is to be completed by September 1, 1988.

We are now prepared to receive proposals for programs to be funded for 1988-89. Additional requirements have been stipulated by the Legislature and are found in Part I below. Please address them in your proposal.

I. Outline of the Criteria in Accordance with the Legislative Intent:

1. Student interns shall be unemployed, out of school and economically disadvantaged, and between the ages of 16 and 21. You are required to indicate in the proposal how the student interns will be identified and how eligibility will be verified.

2. Individual employability assessment plans are essential, and a copy of your plan must be included as part of your request for funding.

3. The programs shall be non-credit in nature.

4. Funds will be provided for services and expenses. Administration costs may be included, but no indirect overhead costs will be funded by the grant.

5. Internships are permitted in public agencies, not-for-profit corporations, and private firms and may not exceed 1000 hours per year or twenty hours per week. You should include in the proposal documentation from organizations indicating a commitment to cooperate with the college in providing the internships.

6. Wages of the interns will be paid from the grant at the rate of regular employees doing a comparable job for the organization.

7. The college will provide employability (life-coping) skills from grant funds. The college will also provide necessary skills training (academic and/or vocational) from grant funds.

8. The college must document a high concentration of unemployed, out-of-school, disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21 from the area to be served. Your entire sponsorship area need not reflect this "high concentration." Should there be more isolated areas within the sponsorship area which deserve such programming, you should document this and be sure to target the project to students there. Documentation from the Department of Labor or other reliable sources is required.

9. The proposal must have a clear statement of program objectives which identifies the desired outcomes of the program.

10. A one-year follow-up of program participants shall be necessary as part of each campus program. Such a follow-up shall require the collection of post-program information on program participants including but not limited to whether a participant receives a high school diploma and subsequent labor market experiences for one year following termination from the program.

II. Other SUNY requirements for the program are as follows:

1. Proposals shall be for more than $65,000 but less than $500,000. The budget must itemize expenditures in the following areas: personal services, equipment and supplies, intern wages, miscellaneous (travel, etc.).

2. Programming is to be described specifically, but concisely. The purpose should be clear, and each of the criteria listed in Part I above must be addressed.

3. An appropriate audit trail is required for funds expended for this program. Records should be kept separate as required by acceptable fund accounting practices. Unused funds shall be returned to the State of New York through the SUNY Office for Finance and Business. Specific formats for financial reporting will also be established by that office.

4. The person coordinating the program for the college must be named.

5. A final report and interim reports on the progress of the program shall be submitted to the Deputy to the Chancellor for Community Colleges as required.

6. Attendance records of students are required.

7. The economically disadvantaged status of students shall be consistent with SUNY Educational Opportunity Program criteria.

8. Some student interns may be enrolled in appropriate non-credit courses at the college or other institutions. Tuition may be paid from the grant. Otherwise, there shall be no state aid or chargebacks for FTE's generated.

9. All unemployed, out-of-work, disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21 shall be eligible for the program. Accordingly, there shall be no prescreening for predictability of success.

10. Student interns must not be enrolled full-time in any other academic program at the college or elsewhere.

11. Proposals shall include a methodology for evaluation of the program.

12. Proposals for ongoing programs will not be acted upon until final reports of the prior year have been approved.

13. Proposals, signed by the **President**, must be submitted to the Deputy to the Chancellor for Community Colleges by **June 25, 1988.**

In addition to the above requirements, proposals including the following will be preferred:

1. There should be clear interaction with the Private Industry Council and the local Youth Bureau and/or other agencies designed to serve the needs of youth or promote economic growth in the community.

2. Stipends, in addition to the internship wage, are encouraged for students. It is assumed that some living expenses for students will be necessary, especially since the internships are part-time. These may include reasonable funding for transportation, child care, and the like.

3. The college may supplement such training funds from Job Training Partnership Act funds or other public or private sources; preferences will be given to proposals which provide for matching sources of funding.

Questions regarding the above may be directed to David Van Nortwick, Director of Community College Administrative Services, or Charles A. Burns, Director of Community College Educational Services, at 518/443-5129.

Thomas S. Kubala

Attachment

Thomas S. Kubala, D.Ed.
Deputy to the Chancellor
for Community Colleges

Copies for information sent to:

Presidents, State-operated Campuses
Deans, Statutory Colleges
President Coll
Vice President Nesheim

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
AUG 04 1989